

*J. List Policy*

53

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

4th March, 1960

COCOM Document No. 3716.68/4

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

ITEM 1668 - TUNGSTEN WIRE

29th February and 3rd March, 1960

Present: Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

Reference: COCOM Document No. 3716.68/3.

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the question which had been raised by the Netherlands Delegate concerning an apparent discrepancy between the English and French texts of Item 1668(b). He invited Delegates to give the views of their authorities.

2. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate said that his authorities considered that it was intended to embargo four types of tungsten wire, namely:

- (a) covered tungsten wire, i.e. wire coated with graphite or some other substance.
- (b) cut coils made from (a) above, a cut coil being a small length of wire wound into a very tight spiral.
- (c) uncovered (bare) tungsten wire.
- (d) cut coils made from (c) above.

From this it followed that sub-item 1668(a) caught types (a) and (b) above, while sub-item 1668(b) caught type (d) and sub-item 1668(c) caught type (c). His authorities felt that the following changes should be made in the French text to bring it into line with the English text:

- Sub-item (a) fils de tungstène revêtus et fils en spirales coupés revêtus
- (b) fils de tungstène revêtus en spirales coupés, ...
- (c) fils de tungstène non revêtus ...

3. The NETHERLANDS Delegate said that the present text of Item 1668 had originated as a Netherlands proposal in the English language and had been translated into French. His authorities therefore felt that the English text was correct and that the French wording should be brought into line with it. Comparing both texts the Netherlands authorities came to a similar conclusion to that expressed by the Delegate of the United Kingdom. For this reason the Netherlands Delegate was able to second the United Kingdom view for the French version if the French Delegation could accept it as well.

4. The FRENCH Delegate agreed ad referendum that the word "revêtus" might appear twice in sub-item (a), as suggested by the United Kingdom Delegate, for the sake of clarity.

5. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that his authorities considered that the English text was correct. He would give their views at a later date as to what the French wording should be.

6. On March 3rd, the United States Delegate said that his authorities could accept the French wording proposed by the United Kingdom Delegate to correspond to the English text.

7. The COMMITTEE decided that the French text of Item 1668 given in paragraph 2 above would come into force on March 20th unless an objection were raised by that date.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~